

No.	Delegates.	Delegates.	
No. 1,	102,	would give her	25
" 2,	86	" " "	21
" 3, 4,	82, 81,	" " "	20
" 5, 6 and 7,	75, 72, 72,	" " "	18
" 8 and 9	67 and 66,	" " "	16
" 10	61	" " "	15
" 11	58	" " "	14
" 12	65	" " "	17
" 13	88	" " "	22

Pretty much the same result in No. 2, 3 and 4 and 13, of the plans of apportioning the House. In plan No. 1, the application is easily made; Frederick and Baltimore counties, would have an additional delegate. Neither of the other counties named would; they having each a number of delegates, already equal to that increase, [102] Mr. MERRICK's plan.

MR. PHELPS If Baltimore has twenty-five, what would Washington and Frederick be entitled to?

MR. BLAKISTONE. Washington would be entitled to five, because she has one-nineteenth of the population of the State, and if you multiply that, five times nineteen would be within five of a hundred, and as you come down the ladder, you can calculate for yourselves.

The seventy-five would give her three, with a very large fraction; seventy-two would give her the same, with a small fraction, and so on down to fifty-eight, would give her two, with no fraction; but when you get to sixty-nine, it would give her three, with an increased fraction again.

Now, sir, I hope that no gentleman will understand me as going for the plan of the gentleman from Baltimore city—representation according to population; but I wish gentlemen to come to a settled and suitable basis, by which the representation of Maryland is hereafter to be regulated, not to be shifted with every change of party, for the purpose of giving the ascendancy to one or the other party, and then, the very next day, to be overturned by some other political party who wish to have a change in the Constitution. Now, the gentleman from Baltimore city, Mr. PRESSMAN, (I am very sorry that he is not here.) says he goes in for compromise, and he read his colleague a most beautiful lecture here yesterday. I, however, have no objection to that, if it was agreeable to his colleague and himself. It was a beautiful compromise where everything was given on one side, and nothing received on the other. Now, do you call that a compromise, when two men agree to settle a difference between them and one holds on and the other gives up all—every point? Sir, it has none of the elements of a compromise about it. None at all. It has not even a squinting at a compromise. Let us go a little further, and I tell you it fell upon my ear, not as the most agreeable sound I ever heard, when I heard gentlemen appealing to—what? To local partialities—to local prejudices—to the reform counties of Maryland to march up and take the whole power in their own hands. Was there no one else here?

Where were the southern tier of counties on the Western Shore with old St. Mary's at their

head, embracing one of the most interesting sections of the whole State—nay, of the world? Where were the eight Eastern Shore counties? But perhaps gentlemen think that Cecil, Caroline, Talbot, and Queen Anne's, being in favor of their peculiar notions of reform, compose the whole Eastern Shore, or at least as much as is at this time worthy of their notice. I, however, entertain a very different opinion. I consider the whole Eastern Shore as a part, and parcel of us, having the same interest the same sentiment, the same rights, and the same common destiny.

I wish my friends from Talbot, Cecil, Queen Anne's, and Caroline, may not find they have a fearful responsibility to answer to their constituents when the day of accounting shall come for the parts they are enacting in this grand political drama. It is no part of my purpose to interpose between honorable gentlemen and their constituents, yet I may be permitted the expression of the opinion, (unless I am most grossly deceived) that their sentiments and opinions, as here expressed, do not reflect the sentiments and opinions of their constituents.

O tempora! O mores! What a change has come over the scene of things.

Where were the southern counties, and the Eastern Shore counties in times that are past and gone, but which have left a sad remembrance behind—a legacy of taxation? Did honorable gentlemen representing Baltimore city and the western counties of Maryland, when they wanted the State to embark in splendid and magnificent works of internal improvements, forget Southern and Eastern Maryland? Oh, no, sir. Did denunciation, and menace, and disparaging epithets characterise their discussions then? Were we reproached with having tyrannized over and oppressed Baltimore city and western Maryland? Were we twitted with the paucity of our numbers? Were we assimilated to the "exploded, rotten borough system of England," to which the honorable gentleman from Cecil, [Mr. McLane,] said, (I think in bad taste,) "some of us were so tenacious of adhering?" Was our poverty held up to ridicule when compared with the wealth of Baltimore and western Maryland? Were we told that their numbers and wealth entitled them to lord it over us, and that we must surrender all political power into their hands, and become "hewers of wood and drawers of water" for their lordships and noble highnesses; their numbers and wealth, "by the grace of God," having made them our legitimate taskmasters?

Nothing of the kind was heard. On the contrary, our patriotism, our liberality, was appealed to. We were then recognised and acknowledged as equals, and that is all that we ever desired, and desire now—we desire no more. The giant city of Baltimore and Western Maryland, then put on no proud and supercilious airs of numerical or pecuniary superiority. In what character did they then appear?—I almost blush to mention it, when I see and know what is enacting before our eyes. In tones of supplication, we were addressed. They argued with us, they reasoned with us. They besought us—they